

REMARKS

Claims 29-38 and 40-59 are pending in this application.

Claims 29, 58 and 59 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 29, 58 and 59 do not introduce any new subject matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of (1) claims 29-36 and 40-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,610,822 ("Murphy") in view of International Application Pub. No. WO 00/38951 ("Mathias"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,300,880 ("Sitnik"); (2) claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Mathias and Sitnik as applied to claim 29, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,311,302 ("Berry"); and (3) claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Mathias and Sitnik as applied to claim 29, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,645 ("Moteki").

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest that the two wireless transmitters are each wired to directly receive the SEL input at a second input position on each of the two wireless transmitters, the two wireless transmitters each having multiplexing capabilities, as essentially recited in amended claims 29, 58 and 59.

For example, referring to Fig. 1A and paragraph 0037 of Applicants' disclosure, the two wireless transmitters 128 and 130 are each wired to directly receive the SEL input at a second input position. The two wireless transmitters 128, 130 each have multiplexing capabilities so that a separate multiplexor(s) between the transmitters and the audio outputs of the input devices 190 is not required. The transmitters so

configured are especially useful in smaller vehicles, such as automobiles, where installation space for the entertainment units is limited.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references, either alone, or in combination, disclose the claimed transmitters that directly receive the SEL input at a second input position, and each have multiplexing capabilities.

Referring to Murphy, the Examiner maintains that the second input position is demonstrated by line 33 providing user input controls 32 to the scheduler/controller 24. In addition, in Murphy, the scheduler/controller 24 functions as a multiplexer by receiving the user input controls 32, providing “cueing control signals for activating and controlling various multi-media components”, providing the “multi-media presentation options to occupants of the vehicle” and receiving the occupant selection at the scheduler/controller 24. See Murphy, col. 4, lines 1-18 and col. 5, lines 3-4.

Unlike Murphy, the claimed transmitters directly receive the SEL input and each have multiplexing capabilities. Accordingly, in contrast to Murphy, as per the claimed embodiments, a separate multiplexor(s) between the transmitters and the audio outputs of the input devices is not required. Different from the claimed embodiments, the scheduler/controller 24 receives and processes the occupant selections, and portion 36 (which the Examiner classifies as the transmitters) does not have multiplexing capabilities.

Accordingly, Murphy fails to disclose the two wireless transmitters that are each wired to directly receive the SEL input at a second input position on each of the two wireless transmitters, and the two wireless transmitters each having multiplexing

capabilities, as essentially recited in amended claims 29, 58 and 59.

Further, Applicants submit that there is no motivation to modify Murphy to remove the multiplexing capabilities from the scheduler/controller 24. As is apparent from Murphy, the elimination of such functionality from the scheduler/controller 24 would completely alter the configuration of Murphy system, which uses the scheduler/controller 24 as the central component through which all inputs, commands and controls are processed and routed.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that as per M.P.E.P. § 2143.01, there is no motivation to modify Murphy to remove such functionality from the scheduler/controller because such a modification would require “a substantial reconstruction and redesign of the elements shown in [Murphy] as well as a change in the basic principle under which the [Murphy] construction was designed to operate”. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.01 (stating that “[i]f the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.”).

For at least the above reasons, Applicants maintain that amended claims 29, 58 and 59 are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the reason that claims 30-38 and 40-57 depend from claim 29, claims 30-38 and 40-57 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

As such, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 29-38 and 40-59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Applicants have not independently addressed the rejections of all the dependent claims because Applicants submit that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, *supra*, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicants however, reserve the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888